

CITY OF MESA

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING

Held in the City of Mesa Council Chambers

Date: October 16, 2008 Time: 4:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Pat Esparza, Chair
Frank Mizner, Vice Chair
Randy Carter
Beth Coons
Scott Perkinson
Chell Roberts
Ken Salas

MEMBERS ABSENT

None.

OTHERS PRESENT

John Wesley
Dorothy Chimel
Tom Ellsworth
Krissa Lucas
Maria Salaiz

Gordon Sheffield
Amy Shackelford
Sean Lake
Susan Demmitt
LTD Class

Others

Chairperson Esparza declared a quorum present and the meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. The meeting was recorded on tape and dated October 16, 2008. Before adjournment at 5:00 p.m., action was taken on the following:

Chairperson Esparza recognized and welcomed the Mesa Leadership, Training and Development (LTD) class 2008/09 to the meeting.

It was moved by Boardmember Mizner, seconded by Boardmember Perkinson that the minutes of the September 4, 2008 special meeting be approved as submitted. Vote: 5-0 with Boardmembers Coons and Salas abstaining.

It was moved by Boardmember Salas, seconded by Boardmember Coons that the minutes of the September 16, 2008, and September 18, 2008 study sessions and regular meeting be approved as submitted. Vote: 6-0 with Boardmember Perkinson abstaining.

Consent Agenda Items: All items identified with an asterisk (*) were approved with one Board motion.

It was moved by Boardmember Carter, seconded by Boardmember Salas that the consent items be approved. Vote: 7-0.

Zoning Cases: Z08-47, *Z08-64, GPMinor08-11, Z08-62, GPMinor08-12, Z08-63

Code Amendment: Amending Section 11-6-3 of the Zoning Ordinance.

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 16, 2008 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z08-47 (District 6)** The 8200 to 8500 blocks of East Baseline Road (north side). Located west of the Loop 202 on the north side of Baseline Road (53± acres). Rezone from AG (conceptual M-1, C-2, O-S, R-3, and R-2) to C-2, PEP, and R-4 and the establishment of the "Baseline Center" Development Master Plan (DMP). This request will establish a Development Master Plan to allow the creation of a mixed-use residential development. David Glimcher, GVSW 202/60 LLC, owner; Susan Demmitt, Beus Gilbert PLLC, applicant.

Comments: The following cases were heard simultaneously but acted on separately: Z08-47, GPMinor08-11 and Z08-62.

Susan Demmitt, Beus Gilbert, 4800 North Scottsdale Road, Scottsdale, AZ, applicant (Z08-47), stated they are in agreement to a continuance and asked that it be to the December's Board hearing. She stated this case was heard by this Board in July 2008, and was approved. Council decided to send it back to the Planning & Zoning Board; she added that this has been a very difficult case, which they have been working on for a year and a half; she noted that when they started this case they had several tenants on board, but given the amount of time that it has taken to process it the tenants are no longer in place. She explained that because of the length of time and the number of concessions they've had to make, they are not sure if they would be moving forward with this project;

Ms. Demmitt stated they would like a 60 day continuance to do an internal evaluation and figure out if this case is something they want to bring forward or not, in which case they may request the case be withdrawn. She asked for feedback from the Board and what the Board expects when they bring this case forward; adding that their clients are happy with the request as it is now and which works well with Mr. Lake's request

Sean Lake, 1930 East Brown Road, Mesa, AZ, applicant (GPMinor08-11, and Z08-62) stated he addressed their position on the develop-ability, viability and land uses of their case at last month's meeting and asked the Board to remember those discussions. He stated they agree to a 60 day continuance and hope they can be fruitful and work with the adjacent owner and staff to come back with something that works well together.

John Wesley, Planning Director, stated as discussed by this Board and Council, staff would like to get more feedback on the issues that need to be worked on to make these properties work together; adding that three topics have been noted: 1) integration of uses, 2) quality of the design and the development and, 3) the overall land use/mix in the area. He explained that the property is mixed use residential and allows 30% to be used as residential; the first piece, represented by Ms. Demmitt is at 30%. Mr. Lake's property is going all residential, which makes the total property more than 30% residential. He stated that staff is opposed to that and favors the current General Plan. He noted that there was some willingness by the Board, that maybe there wasn't that much concern about the amount of overall residential, if the mixes and integration were right.

Boardmember Mizner commented that this Board considered the properties at different times, which cause some consternation when Mr. Gilbert's case got to the City Council and they saw that the two projects were not coordinated; he added that this is a difficult property because it has great freeway visibility but lousy access. He asked Mr. Lake if there has already been a land trade for the "dog leg" portion, and how he saw this playing out from a land use/development point of view, especially if his client wants to develop first.

Mr. Lake responded that they had discussions with Mr. Gilbert and the agreement they've reached is to swap the value of the land for a road access easement that is going to be used to access both properties. He explained that the visibility is difficult because there is a screen wall along US 60 and they have no access onto Baseline, other than this road agreement that exist along the Hawes Road alignment, which will determine the land uses; he added that they are working with a tenant on a site plan.

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 16, 2008 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Boardmember Carter commented that there is an opportunity to do something spectacular on this site; he asked Ms. Demmitt if they would be showing the use of the “dog leg” in their plans and if the constraints from the Economic Development Department were taken away would they come up with a different idea for the entire area. He stated that it would be impractical for office use and suggested that the 30% constraint of residential be thrown out, and a well designed, integrated type of project be considered with residential towards the back and something interesting towards the front to make it unique.

Ms. Demmitt responded No, unless they have reached a formal agreement with the other owner and would want to work through that before they show that change on the site plan. She mentioned that they have elected to work within the existing General Plan, which mandates that there be a reasonable mix of uses. She explained that they originally started out with a request from Economic Development to provide a “Class A” office project, which was not realistic and that position has changed, she added that if they had their choice, they would come back with a smaller percent of office. Discussion ensued regarding allowing flexibility on the land uses and the integration of both projects.

Boardmember Mizner concurred with Mr. Carter and the idea of exploring a different mix of land uses; he added that job creation in Mesa is very important. He suggested keeping the current general concept but move them around, which would give more flexibility and design and to do some land trades so that they don’t wind up with such rectilinear parcels.

Boardmember Perkinson agreed with Boardmembers Carter and Mizner and added that as a City if they want this land to develop they need to make this work and not take such a hard line and allow some changes.

Boardmember Roberts dittoed Boardmember’s comments, adding that he would like to see that true mixed use, integration, and traffic be addressed.

Boardmember Salas also agreed with Boardmember’s comments and noted that the limited access would prohibit office space that would eventually be vacant. He added that they look at accessibility as they bringing forth a proposal.

Boardmember Coons stated that 18 months is a long time for a development to be in the rezoning process and hoped they could resolve issues and move forward quickly. She agreed that there should be some flexibility and added that she sat on the 2025 Planning Committee and they did not know the exact access off of the freeway.

Chairperson Esparza commented that this is a symbol from the Board that highly suggests that they move forward to explore the mixture of uses, accessibility and integration of the two parcels. It was moved by Boardmember Mizner, seconded by Boardmember Salas

That: The Board **continue** zoning case Z08-47 to the December 18, 2008 hearing.

Vote: Passed 7-0.

* * * * *

Note: *Audiotapes of the Planning & Zoning Board Meetings are available in the Planning Division Office for review. They are also “live broadcasted” through the City of Mesa’s website at www.mesaaz.gov*

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 16, 2008 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z08-64 (District 6)** 5460 South Mountain Road. Located South of Ray Road and east of Signal Butte Road (62± ac). Rezone from R-2 PAD DMP to R1-9 PAD DMP and Modification to the Mountain Horizons Development Master Plan. This request will allow for the development of a single residential subdivision. Pulte Homes, Tim Loughrin, owner; Ralph Pew, Pew & Lake, PLC, applicant. Also consider the preliminary plat.

Comments: This case was on the consent agenda, therefore, it was not discussed individually.

It was moved by Boardmember Carter, seconded by Boardmember Salas

That: The Board approve the preliminary plat and recommend to the City Council **approval** of zoning case Z08-64 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, preliminary plat, and elevations (without guarantee of lot yield, building count, lot coverage).
2. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
3. Dedicate the right-of-way required under the Mesa City Code at the time of application for a building permit, at the time of recordation of the subdivision plat, or at the time of the City's request for dedication whichever comes first.
4. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Technical Review Committee.
5. Written notice to be given to future residents that this subdivision is within two (2) miles of Phoenix Mesa Gateway Airport.
6. Owner granting an Avigation Easement and Release to the City, pertaining to the Phoenix Mesa Gateway Airport, which will be prepared and recorded by the City (concurrently with the recordation of the final subdivision map, prior to the issuance of a building permit).
7. Noise attenuation measures be incorporated into the design and construction of the homes to achieve a noise level reduction of 25 db.

Vote: Passed 7-0.

* * * * *

Note: *Audiotapes of the Planning & Zoning Board Meetings are available in the Planning Division Office for review. They are also "live broadcasted" through the City of Mesa's website at www.mesaaz.gov*

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 16, 2008 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **GPMInor08-11 (District 6)** 8260 East Baseline Road. Located west of the Loop 202 and north of Baseline Road (14.5± acres). Minor General Plan Amendment. This request will amend the Mesa 2025 General Plan land use designation for the site from Mixed Use Residential (MUR) to High Density Residential 15+ du/acre (HDR 15+). Loren & Colette Jessen; Jessco Dev. LLC, owner; Sean Lake; Pew and Lake, PLC, applicant. **COMPANION CASE Z08-62. CONTINUED FROM THE SEPTEMBER 18, 2008 HEARING.**

Comments: The following cases were heard simultaneously but acted on separately: Z08-47, GPMInor08-11 and Z08-62.

Susan Demmitt, Beus Gilbert, 4800 North Scottsdale Road, Scottsdale, AZ, applicant (Z08-47), stated they are in agreement to a continuance and asked that it be to the December's Board hearing. She stated this case was heard by this Board in July 2008, and was approved. Council decided to send it back to the Planning & Zoning Board; she added that this has been a very difficult case, which they have been working on for a year and a half; she noted that when they started this case they had several tenants on board, but given the amount of time that it has taken to process it the tenants are no longer in place. She explained that because of the length of time and the number of concessions they've had to make, they are not sure if they would be moving forward with this project;

Ms. Demmitt stated they would like a 60 day continuance to do an internal evaluation and figure out if this case is something they want to bring forward or not, in which case they may request the case be withdrawn. She asked for feedback from the Board and what the Board expects when they bring this case forward; adding that their clients are happy with the request as it is now and which works well with Mr. Lake's request

Sean Lake, 1930 East Brown Road, Mesa, AZ, applicant (GPMInor08-11, and Z08-62) stated he addressed their position on the develop-ability, viability and land uses of their case at last month's meeting and asked the Board to remember those discussions. He stated they agree to a 60 day continuance and hope they can be fruitful and work with the adjacent owner and staff to come back with something that works well together.

John Wesley, Planning Director, stated as discussed by this Board and Council, staff would like to get more feedback on the issues that need to be worked on to make these properties work together; adding that three topics have been noted: 1) integration of uses, 2) quality of the design and the development and, 3) the overall land use/mix in the area. He explained that the property is mixed use residential and allows 30% to be used as residential; the first piece, represented by Ms. Demmitt is at 30%. Mr. Lake's property is going all residential, which makes the total property more than 30% residential. He stated that staff is opposed to that and favors the current General Plan. He noted that there was some willingness by the Board, that maybe there wasn't that much concern about the amount of overall residential, if the mixes and integration were right.

Boardmember Mizner commented that this Board considered the properties at different times, which cause some consternation when Mr. Gilbert's case got to the City Council and they saw that the two projects were not coordinated; he added that this is a difficult property because it has great freeway visibility but lousy access. He asked Mr. Lake if there has already been a land trade for the "dog leg" portion, and how he saw this playing out from a land use/development point of view, especially if his client wants to develop first.

Mr. Lake responded that they had discussions with Mr. Gilbert and the agreement they've reached is to swap the value of the land for a road access easement that is going to be used to access both properties. He explained that the visibility is difficult because there is a screen wall along US 60 and they have no access onto Baseline, other than this road agreement that exist along the Hawes Road alignment, which will determine the land uses; he added that they are working with a tenant on a site plan.

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 16, 2008 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Boardmember Carter commented that there is an opportunity to do something spectacular on this site; he asked Ms. Demmitt if they would be showing the use of the “dog leg” in their plans and if the constraints from the Economic Development Department were taken away would they come up with a different idea for the entire area. He stated that it would be impractical for office use and suggested that the 30% constraint of residential be thrown out, and a well designed, integrated type of project be considered with residential towards the back and something interesting towards the front to make it unique.

Ms. Demmitt responded No, unless they have reached a formal agreement with the other owner and would want to work through that before they show that change on the site plan. She mentioned that they have elected to work within the existing General Plan, which mandates that there be a reasonable mix of uses. She explained that they originally started out with a request from Economic Development to provide a “Class A” office project, which was not realistic and that position has changed, she added that if they had their choice, they would come back with a smaller percent of office. Discussion ensued regarding allowing flexibility on the land uses and the integration of both projects.

Boardmember Mizner concurred with Mr. Carter and the idea of exploring a different mix of land uses; he added that job creation in Mesa is very important. He suggested keeping the current general concept but move them around, which would give more flexibility and design and to do some land trades so that they don’t wind up with such rectilinear parcels.

Boardmember Perkinson agreed with Boardmembers Carter and Mizner and added that as a City if they want this land to develop they need to make this work and not take such a hard line and allow some changes.

Boardmember Roberts dittoed Boardmember’s comments, adding that he would like to see that true mixed use, integration, and traffic be addressed.

Boardmember Salas also agreed with Boardmember’s comments and noted that the limited access would prohibit office space that would eventually be vacant. He added that they look at accessibility as they bringing forth a proposal.

Boardmember Coons stated that 18 months is a long time for a development to be in the rezoning process and hoped they could resolve issues and move forward quickly. She agreed that there should be some flexibility and added that she sat on the 2025 Planning Committee and they did not know the exact access off of the freeway.

Chairperson Esparza commented that this is a symbol from the Board that highly suggests that they move forward to explore the mixture of uses, accessibility and integration of the two parcels. It was moved by Boardmember Mizner, seconded by Boardmember Salas

It was moved by Boardmember Mizner, seconded by Boardmember Roberts

That: The Board **continue** zoning case GPMinor08-11 to the December 18, 2008 hearing.

Vote: Passed 7-0.

* * * * *

Note: *Audiotapes of the Planning & Zoning Board Meetings are available in the Planning Division Office for review. They are also “live broadcasted” through the City of Mesa’s website at www.mesaaz.gov*

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 16, 2008 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z08-62 (District 6)** 8260 East Baseline Road. Located west of the Loop 202 and north of Baseline Road (14.5± acres). District 6. Rezone from AG (conceptual M-1, C-2, R-2, and R-3) to R-4. This request will allow the zoning for high-density residential development. Loren & Colette Jessen; Jessco Dev. LLC, owner; Sean Lake; Pew and Lake, PLC, applicant. **COMPANION CASE GPMINOR08-11. CONTINUED FROM THE SEPTEMBER 18, 2008 HEARING.**

Comments: The following cases were heard simultaneously but acted on separately: Z08-47, GPMINOR08-11 and Z08-62.

Susan Demmitt, Beus Gilbert, 4800 North Scottsdale Road, Scottsdale, AZ, applicant (Z08-47), stated they are in agreement to a continuance and asked that it be to the December's Board hearing. She stated this case was heard by this Board in July 2008, and was approved. Council decided to send it back to the Planning & Zoning Board; she added that this has been a very difficult case, which they have been working on for a year and a half; she noted that when they started this case they had several tenants on board, but given the amount of time that it has taken to process it the tenants are no longer in place. She explained that because of the length of time and the number of concessions they've had to make, they are not sure if they would be moving forward with this project;

Ms. Demmitt stated they would like a 60 day continuance to do an internal evaluation and figure out if this case is something they want to bring forward or not, in which case they may request the case be withdrawn. She asked for feedback from the Board and what the Board expects when they bring this case forward; adding that their clients are happy with the request as it is now and which works well with Mr. Lake's request

Sean Lake, 1930 East Brown Road, Mesa, AZ, applicant (GPMINOR08-11, and Z08-62) stated he addressed their position on the develop-ability, viability and land uses of their case at last month's meeting and asked the Board to remember those discussions. He stated they agree to a 60 day continuance and hope they can be fruitful and work with the adjacent owner and staff to come back with something that works well together.

John Wesley, Planning Director, stated as discussed by this Board and Council, staff would like to get more feedback on the issues that need to be worked on to make these properties work together; adding that three topics have been noted: 1) integration of uses, 2) quality of the design and the development and, 3) the overall land use/mix in the area. He explained that the property is mixed use residential and allows 30% to be used as residential; the first piece, represented by Ms. Demmitt is at 30%. Mr. Lake's property is going all residential, which makes the total property more than 30% residential. He stated that staff is opposed to that and favors the current General Plan. He noted that there was some willingness by the Board, that maybe there wasn't that much concern about the amount of overall residential, if the mixes and integration were right.

Boardmember Mizner commented that this Board considered the properties at different times, which cause some consternation when Mr. Gilbert's case got to the City Council and they saw that the two projects were not coordinated; he added that this is a difficult property because it has great freeway visibility but lousy access. He asked Mr. Lake if there has already been a land trade for the "dog leg" portion, and how he saw this playing out from a land use/development point of view, especially if his client wants to develop first.

Mr. Lake responded that they had discussions with Mr. Gilbert and the agreement they've reached is to swap the value of the land for a road access easement that is going to be used to access both properties. He explained that the visibility is difficult because there is a screen wall along US 60 and they have no access onto Baseline, other than this road agreement that exist along the Hawes Road alignment, which will determine the land uses; he added that they are working with a tenant on a site plan.

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 16, 2008 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Boardmember Carter commented that there is an opportunity to do something spectacular on this site; he asked Ms. Demmitt if they would be showing the use of the “dog leg” in their plans and if the constraints from the Economic Development Department were taken away would they come up with a different idea for the entire area. He stated that it would be impractical for office use and suggested that the 30% constraint of residential be thrown out, and a well designed, integrated type of project be considered with residential towards the back and something interesting towards the front to make it unique.

Ms. Demmitt responded No, unless they have reached a formal agreement with the other owner and would want to work through that before they show that change on the site plan. She mentioned that they have elected to work within the existing General Plan, which mandates that there be a reasonable mix of uses. She explained that they originally started out with a request from Economic Development to provide a “Class A” office project, which was not realistic and that position has changed, she added that if they had their choice, they would come back with a smaller percent of office. Discussion ensued regarding allowing flexibility on the land uses and the integration of both projects.

Boardmember Mizner concurred with Mr. Carter and the idea of exploring a different mix of land uses; he added that job creation in Mesa is very important. He suggested keeping the current general concept but move them around, which would give more flexibility and design and to do some land trades so that they don’t wind up with such rectilinear parcels.

Boardmember Perkinson agreed with Boardmembers Carter and Mizner and added that as a City if they want this land to develop they need to make this work and not take such a hard line and allow some changes.

Boardmember Roberts dittoed Boardmember’s comments, adding that he would like to see that true mixed use, integration, and traffic be addressed.

Boardmember Salas also agreed with Boardmember’s comments and noted that the limited access would prohibit office space that would eventually be vacant. He added that they look at accessibility as they bringing forth a proposal.

Boardmember Coons stated that 18 months is a long time for a development to be in the rezoning process and hoped they could resolve issues and move forward quickly. She agreed that there should be some flexibility and added that she sat on the 2025 Planning Committee and they did not know the exact access off of the freeway.

Chairperson Esparza commented that this is a symbol from the Board that highly suggests that they move forward to explore the mixture of uses, accessibility and integration of the two parcels. It was moved by Boardmember Mizner, seconded by Boardmember Salas

It was moved by Boardmember Carter, seconded by Boardmember Coons

That: The Board **continue** zoning case Z08-62 to the December 18, 2008 hearing.

Vote: Passed 7-0.

* * * * *

Note: *Audiotapes of the Planning & Zoning Board Meetings are available in the Planning Division Office for review. They are also “live broadcasted” through the City of Mesa’s website at www.mesaaz.gov*

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 16, 2008 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **GPMInor08-12 (District 5)** The 3200 to 3300 blocks of North Recker Road (west side). Located north of Longbow Parkway and west of Recker Road. (49.08± ac.) General Plan Minor Amendment to change the General Plan Land Use Map from Business Park (BP) to Community Commercial (CC). This request will allow for commercial uses and align the land use category for this site with the Falcon Field Sub-Area Plan. Associates, LLC, Robert M. McNichols, managing member, owner; Sean Lake, Pew and Lake, PLC, applicant. **COMPANION CASE Z08-63.**

Comments: Sean Lake, 1930 East Brown Road, Mesa, AZ, applicant, stated they requesting an update to the previously approved Development Master Plan (DMP) and explained that when the original DMP was approved, it had a "laundry list" of conditions, which they have incorporated to become one document that can be moved forward as the project develops. He stated that the minor General Plan Amendment (GPA) is for Lot 3 only, to bring the 2025 General Plan consistent with the Falcon Field Sub Area Plan (FFSAP). He explained their rezoning request to C-2 DMP and added that the C-2 designation would be consistent with the General Plan and the General Plan would be consistent with the FFSAP. Mr. Lake stated that as this development moves forward and tenants are identified, they will bring a site plan back before this Board for approval; he noted that this is an outstanding project, which they believe will benefit the property owner, the City and the people who live in the area, he urged the Board for their support.

Krissa Lucas, Planner II, explained that the GPA is to change the land use designation for Lot 3 from Business Park to Community Commercial and staff is recommending adoption; she added that this will bring the GPA designation into alignment with the FFSAP. She also explained that the applicant is recommending that Lot 3 be rezoned to C-2 DMP (Conceptual BIZ) to allow for future commercial uses and that staff is supportive of the rezoning. She noted that they are requesting minor modifications to the DMP to bring it into alignment with the Conditions of Approval that were adopted in 2002, as well as reconfigure the zoning to align with the approved subdivision plat and staff is recommending approval with conditions.

Boardmember Roberts noted that this area is known for its community involvement; he asked Mr. Lake what neighborhoods were actually notified within the boundaries of the 1000'. Mr. Lake responded that there were two tiers that were involved with the participation: 1) the extensive neighborhood involvement that went forward with the FFSAP, which is detailed very specifically in this Plan and; 2) when the application was processed they notified residents, HOA's, and specific representatives of the area. He added that there was a very good neighborhood participation program on both tiers that took place.

Boardmember Mizner commented that the alignments of all these plans will be consistent with the approved documents and agreed with Mr. Roberts that there is a lot of interest in this area. He urged Mr. Lake to stay involved with the surrounding neighborhoods.

Boardmember Carter asked why Lots 1, 6 and 7 are conditioned to be reviewed by this Board. Ms. Lucas responded that it was a condition that was approved by City Council in 2002; she added that the applicant has agreed to have the Design Review Board review all of the development, except for Lot 8, which is the golf course.

Dorothy Chimel reiterated that the conditions were part of the original DMP and it was part of the negotiated stipulations at that time. Discussion ensued regarding review of the 200' by the Board.

Mr. Lake also stated that it was part of a negotiated agreement and that's what Council decided on and did.

It was moved by Boardmember Perkinson, seconded by Boardmember Roberts

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 16, 2008 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

That: The Board approve and recommend to the City Council **adoption** of zoning case GPMInor08-12.

Vote: Passed 7-0.

* * * * *

Note: *Audiotapes of the Planning & Zoning Board Meetings are available in the Planning Division Office for review. They are also “live broadcasted” through the City of Mesa’s website at www.mesaaz.gov*

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 16, 2008 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z08-63 (District 5)** The 2800 to 3100 blocks of North Higley Road (east to Recker Road) and the 3200 to 3300 blocks of North Recker Road (west side). Located north of McDowell Road between Higley Road and Recker Road. (313.42± ac.). Modification of the Longbow Business Park and Golf Club Development Master Plan (313.42± ac.). Rezone from M-1 DMP and M-1 DMP (Conceptual BIZ) to C-2 DMP (Conceptual BIZ) (49.08± ac.). This request will modify the existing Development Master Plan to reconfigure the zoning to align with the approved subdivision plat and allow for future commercial and employment uses. Associates, LLC, Robert M. McNichols, managing member, owner; Sean Lake, Pew and Lake, PLC, applicant. **COMPANION CASE GPMINOR08-12.**

Comments: Sean Lake, 1930 East Brown Road, Mesa, AZ, applicant, stated they requesting an update to the previously approved Development Master Plan (DMP) and explained that when the original DMP was approved, it had a "laundry list" of conditions, which they have incorporated to become one document that can be moved forward as the project develops. He stated that the minor General Plan Amendment (GPA) is for Lot 3 only, to bring the 2025 General Plan consistent with the Falcon Field Sub Area Plan (FFSAP). He explained their rezoning request to C-2 DMP and added that the C-2 designation would be consistent with the General Plan and the General Plan would be consistent with the FFSAP. Mr. Lake stated that as this development moves forward and tenants are identified, they will bring a site plan back before this Board for approval; he noted that this is an outstanding project, which they believe will benefit the property owner, the City and the people who live in the area, he urged the Board for their support.

Krissa Lucas, Planner II, explained that the GPA is to change the land use designation for Lot 3 from Business Park to Community Commercial and staff is recommending adoption; she added that this will bring the GPA designation into alignment with the FFSAP. She also explained that the applicant is recommending that Lot 3 be rezoned to C-2 DMP (Conceptual BIZ) to allow for future commercial uses and that staff is supportive of the rezoning. She noted that they are requesting minor modifications to the DMP to bring it into alignment with the Conditions of Approval that were adopted in 2002, as well as reconfigure the zoning to align with the approved subdivision plat and staff is recommending approval with conditions.

Boardmember Roberts noted that this area is known for its community involvement; he asked Mr. Lake what neighborhoods were actually notified within the boundaries of the 1000'. Mr. Lake responded that there were two tiers that were involved with the participation: 1) the extensive neighborhood involvement that went forward with the FFSAP, which is detailed very specifically in this Plan and; 2) when the application was processed they notified residents, HOA's, and specific representatives of the area. He added that there was a very good neighborhood participation program on both tiers that took place.

Boardmember Mizner commented that the alignments of all these plans will be consistent with the approved documents and agreed with Mr. Roberts that there is a lot of interest in this area. He urged Mr. Lake to stay involved with the surrounding neighborhoods.

Boardmember Carter asked why Lots 1, 6 and 7 are conditioned to be reviewed by this Board. Ms. Lucas responded that it was a condition that was approved by City Council in 2002; she added that the applicant has agreed to have the Design Review Board review all of the development, except for Lot 8, which is the golf course.

Dorothy Chimel reiterated that the conditions were part of the original DMP and it was part of the negotiated stipulations at that time. Discussion ensued regarding review of the 200' by the Board.

Mr. Lake also stated that it was part of a negotiated agreement and that's what Council decided on and did.

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 16, 2008 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

It was moved by Boardmember Salas, seconded by Boardmember Coons

That: The Board approve and recommend to the City Council **approval** of zoning case Z08-62 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the basic development as described in the Development Master Plan (without guarantee of lot yield, building count, building height, building placement, or lot coverage).
2. Future Site Plan Review by the Planning and Zoning Board as follows:
 - a. Lot 1 – Any development of which a part or whole is within 200' of Higley Road.
 - b. Lot 3 – Entire lot.
 - c. Lot 4 – Entire lot.
 - d. Lot 6 – Any development of which a part or whole is within 200' of McDowell Road.
 - e. Lot 7 – Any development of which a part or whole is within 200' of McDowell Road.
3. Review and approval by the Design Review Board of all future development, except for Lot 8.
4. Review and approval by the Planning and Zoning Board and City Council of future development plans requiring a Bonus Intensity Zone (BIZ) overlay district.
5. In the event that any individual development parcel is used to stockpile material; (a) the length of time that material is to be stored cannot exceed 60 days (unless extended by the Planning Division staff; (b) stockpiled material shall be screened by a 6 foot high opaque fence (which may be a chain link fence with full windscreening); (c) the stockpiled material must be located at least 200 feet from an arterial street and Longbow Parkway); and (d) the stockpiled material cannot exceed six feet in height.
6. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations, including the Subdivision Regulations.
7. Noise attenuation measures be incorporated into the design and construction to achieve a noise level reduction of 25 decibels, except for those buildings which are manufacturing only, unless otherwise approved by staff.
8. Landscaping within storage yards is not required when those yards are fully screened by a full height wall from any public area. Alternative screening may be provided subject to the approval of Design Review staff.
9. The minimum building setback requirements are as follows:
 - a. Front setback to be not less than thirty (30) feet.
 - b. Double frontage lots (through lots) to have setbacks not less than thirty (30) feet at each street.
 - c. Corner lots to have not less than thirty (30) feet at each street.
 - d. Side setbacks to be not less than fifteen (15) feet on each side of the building.
 - e. Rear setbacks to be not less than twenty (20) feet except where the rear of a parcel abuts any golf course property, then the rear setback is to be not less than ten (10) feet.

Vote: Passed 7-0.

* * * * *

Note: *Audiotapes of the Planning & Zoning Board Meetings are available in the Planning Division Office for review. They are also "live broadcasted" through the City of Mesa's website at www.mesaaz.gov*

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 16, 2008 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: Amending Section 11-6-3 of the Zoning Ordinance. The amendment proposes minor wording revisions to clarify language used to describe standards and evaluation criteria related to land uses requiring Council Use Permits in the C-1, C-2, and C-3 zoning districts.

Comments: This case was on the consent agenda, therefore, it was not discussed individually.

It was moved by Boardmember Carter, seconded by Boardmember Salas

That: The Board approve and recommend to the City Council **adoption** of amending Section 11-6-3 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Vote: Passed 7-0.

* * * * *

Note: *Audiotapes of the Planning & Zoning Board Meetings are available in the Planning Division Office for review. They are also “live broadcasted” through the City of Mesa’s website at www.mesaaz.gov*

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 16, 2008 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Respectfully submitted,

John Wesley, Secretary
Planning Director

MS:
I:\P&Z\P&Z 08\Minutes\oct16-08.doc